

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-8347**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MELVIN A. FORD,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 08-8348**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

NORMAN O'NEAL BROWN,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 08-8349**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PAUL WINESTOCK, JR.,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 08-8350**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL STEVEN SMITH,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 08-8351**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEFFREY ANDREW REID,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 08-8352**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WALTER TREVAUGHN SMITH,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior District Judge. (1:90-cr-00454-WMN-5; 1:90-cr-00454-WMN-4; 1:90-cr-00454-WMN-3; 1:90-cr-00454-WMN-8; 1:90-cr-00454-WMN-10; 1:90-cr-00454-WMN-2)

---

Submitted: February 24, 2009

Decided: March 18, 2009

---

Before MICHAEL, GREGORY, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Paresh S. Patel, OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellants. Barbara Slaymaker Sale, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Melvin Ford, Norman Brown, Paul Winestock, Jr., Michael Smith, Jeffrey Reid, and Walter Smith appeal the district court's order denying their motion for reduction of sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) (2006). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. See United States v. Dunphy, 551 F.3d 247 (4th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order for the reasons stated by the court. United States v. Brown, No. 1:90-cr-00454-WMN (D. Md. Oct. 6, 2008). We also deny appellant Winestock's motions for appointment of counsel and for judicial notice. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED